

THURSDAY, JANUARY 2, 1851.

On motion by Mr. DAVIS, ordered that the memorial and accompanying papers be printed.

Mr. BERRIEN, in pursuance of notice, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize notaries public to take and certify oaths, affirmations, and acknowledgments in certain cases; which was read a first and second time by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FORTIFICATION OF SHIP ISLAND.

CALIFORNIA LAND TITLES.

On motion of Mr. GWIN, the Senate resumed the consideration of the "bill to ascertain and settle the private land claims in the State of California;" the pending question being the substitute, offered by Mr. CROCKER.

Mr. President. I will state by

commissioners and the District Court, as well as the Supreme Court, to be in accordance with the principles of this act, so far as they are applicable. But then another important provision is the act of 23d May, 1828, which I wish to have revived and enforced before the Board of Commis-

MR. BENTON. Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment to the bill which has been presented by the Senator from California, which is, to strike out the whole of the bill, and substitute a totally different system. I then intended to do this, I gave notice of it yesterday. I then also stated to the Senate that since the marvellous times when Great Britain was conquered by William the Conqueror, and when all the lands of the country were considered as belonging to the conquerors, and especially in the age of the Crusades, when the lands of the East were taken from the country, conquered by arms or ceded by authority, in which the land titles of the whole country were arraigned in a mass, making the whole invalid until proved to be good. I stated that to be a principle unknown in the civilized world at this day. And I then stated that the Government of the State of California, which has been brought into the world, should have felt themselves so far influenced by what was being done in the case of Louisiana and Florida as to conform to the idea of bringing in a board of commissioners, and afterwards a commissioner, before whom all the titles should be arraigned, and the whole of the bill should be valid, and to continue to be held invalid until they run the gauntlet of three different lawsuits; for the gauntlet is to be run, and, in every case and every time, before a tribunal appointed by the United States Government itself, which the other party have not the right even to object to, which they

But the substitute which is before us goes the whole length of running the gauntlet of all three trials. And what must be the result? It must be that the claimant, except in some great cases, and cases in which probably some American emigrants have been wronged, must undergo the trial of law, the trial of fact, and the trial of conscience. And that the parties will surrender their claims rather than undertake to pursue them through these lawsuits. I have deemed it particularly hard to apply these principles to any people, and especially to the people of California, who were induced by the most liberal assistance on the part of the Crown of Spain to go there and accept these lands as a gracious gift. The people were induced to go there, sir, and accept these lands as a gracious gift: they were offered great inducements to accept of them. They received assistance from the Crown of Spain, or from the Government, in taking possession of the lands, and cultivating them, and in erecting settlements. They were exempted from all contributions for a certain number of years, and the stations—presidios, as they are called—*presidios* in the Latin—were established for the purpose of protecting the settlers in their rights.

Since the Crown of Spain was a despotism, but there are
 records in which it was the kindest and most paternal
 of Governments, and in which every giving land to any
 citizen according to his pursuit and station was free. If he was
 in a town or village he received a portion of land of a certain
 number of varas square—a vara is a little more than a yard,
 and three geometrical feet—and they gave him an outlet in the
 common lands for the inhabitant of a village or pueblo.
 And that, they gave to farmers and to the soldiers, and to
 the lands which were proper for cultivation, taking care that they
 should have land, if there were such, which was cultivable
 and fit for cultivation by rain which fell upon it.
 Others cultivated by irrigation, and where water was necessary
 the water was sold to them, and they were obliged to have his
 price. These lands were called *regadíos*.
 The others which were watered by rain were called *temporales*.
 Besides that, they gave *ranchos*, consisting of large districts,
 but not quite as large as were formerly given in these colonies:
 not quite as large as Maryland gave to Lord Calvert, or
 Pennsylvania gave to William Penn, nor the Virginia grants,
 which were for forty-acre grants. They gave lands,
 air, and it is curious that there were more minimums than
 maximums. It was more frequent that the grant declared
 that the grant should not be less than it should not be more;
 and under the limitation of more, the ordinary grant for the
 purposes of raising stock, as this was, was the maximum
 which a colonial or local authority could grant.

The Spanish Crown throughout Texas and every where else, twined all these inducements to get settlers, had a class of settlements to be made by what the Spanish law calls an *empresario*, which may be translated contractor, and this contractor was to receive a large compensation in land for procuring persons to come and settle on the land. Usually a

Now, sir, when we have got possession of such a people as this, how strange it is to find ourselves arraigning at once every title, holding every title to be a fraud against the United States, until these parties shall prove in three different courts, and one of them the Supreme Court of the United States, that they were not frauds against the United States.

acquired by us by cession, or that she had joined as Texas did, or that she had been ceded to us by some foreign Power. In either case suppose any Power should undertake to enforce upon Kentucky what we now propose to undertake to enforce upon Louisiana, requiring every citizen to go before a tribunal and make good his title to his land, and then go before another tribunal and make it good there, and after that make him come before the Supreme Court of the United States, and if he did not make it good in all three cases, take away his land and give it to the public. Suppose we undertake to do such a thing as that in Kentucky. Sir, we would have a revolt in which the men of Kentucky would quit these United States. That is what we would have. Yes, sir, they would quit the United States, the whole of them. If you then, Sir, were to undertake to do such a thing in Louisiana, it is against a feeble people, too feeble to resist; such as may be unable to resist the power of those who want their substance and may be crushed by the Government. It cannot be done with respect to any other people than those thus situated.

the consequence of an intention on the part of one of the greatest generals and greatest statesmen to elevate them, by causing the titles to be registered for the purpose of raising them to the tenure and dignity of the feudal tenure in English, which would be an advantage to the landholders of Egypt, for as the titles were to be registered, the king would be obliged to be fortified by treason to the sovereign, but they held them at the mere will and pleasure of the sovereign, who reclaimed them when he pleased without assigning any reason. The design of the intendant, who was an able man, was to raise the dignity of these titles to that of the feudal tenure, so that the king would be obliged to be fortified by treason to the greatest statesman as well as the greatest general hesitated long time before he consented. He went to his intendant, saying to him how difficult it would be to touch the titles, and that there was no knowing to what degree the country would be fortified by treason to the sovereign, but he was told that the titles, without benefiting themselves. Every thing turned out as that man feared. The people looked upon the king as call to register their titles as worse than taxation. The single result ever known sprung out of that, and by one great Emperor more he pitied the people, for he knew they were alarmed to individual death; for he knew they were alarmed to the deepest extent, and he knew there was an excuse for them, and that they had suffered enough without putting any of

We have printed to our minds, in some of the public prints, the idea of possessions in the hands of private persons in California worth millions, thousands of millions. When these hundreds and thousands of millions come to be weighed and measured, I apprehend they will be found to be but a poor remnant of these immense sums.

I intended, as I gave notice at the last session that I should do, to bring forward a bill to divide from all that have been proposed. There was then nothing through my mind to plan which I have drawn up, and which I think has some system in it, some equity in it, and which, if it can be properly explained to the people of the country, will save them from that alarm, agitation, and despair, into which all people must be thrown upon the apprehension of having their property taken from them. Let any one of us be informed that a hole has been picked in the title by which we hold our property at home; that we are to have a lawsuit to test our title. Every one thus situated would quit his station here in this chamber, and go home at once to attend to his hole and his lawsuit. I think that I have now said

be shall record. After he has thus got copies of all the titles collected, which may be done perhaps in a single season, he is to make out an abstract and send it here to the Government of the United States, for the Government to examine and ascertain the title to every claim. Then, in connection with the abstract, he is to send the original of the title, and in cases where he shall conclude the titles are invalid for any cause, no matter what, the recorder of land titles and district attorney shall cause a *scire facit* to be issued against the party whose title shall be impeached, and he shall be required to come into court and give reasons why it shall not be set aside. In cases where the recorder of titles will be confined to cases in which two officers shall decide that there are some reasons for questioning their validity. The plan proceeds to secure to those who occupied certain places of property in small parcels in the possession of it at that time, without being subjected to the chances of a *scire facit*, by a special decree of the captain general of the internal western provinces of Mexico, four leagues square were given to the inhabitants of the towns for their lots. These four leagues belong to them thus bringing a two-league way free. My title for the four leagues shall be confirmed. My title for people without bringing a two-league fight for his little lot, for so many leagues, so many yarde square.

My bill provides that, upon the trial of this *scire facit*, if the decision goes in favor of the claimant, it shall be conclusive against the United States in all cases but one. There is

Whatever I have done upon this subject I have done disinterestedly—acting, as I believe, justly towards a people who cannot help themselves. In whatever Mr. FREMONT has done he has been disinterested—acting in a manner

Mr. GWIN. Mr. President, when I called up this bill a few days ago, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BASTON) is reported to have made the following statement:

"Upon looking into the amendment, I believe that when the time comes that there is a full Senate—for the bill requires a full Senate to attend to it—I shall be able to show that the effect of the bill will be to violate our treaty with Mexico; to violate the law of nations; to violate the proclamation of Com. Stockton; to violate the capitulation at Monterey; and the effect of it will be to depopulate the old inhabitants of California of their lands."

Before proceeding to reply to the Senator's remarks, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the personal bearing of Mr. Faxon's speech, against the Senate, and the Senator's reply to it. I have read the amendment to my colleague's (Mr. Faxon's) bill, adopted by the Senate in Committee of the Whole, and now before us for our action, was presented by me after full consultation with my colleagues in the other house, (Messrs. GILBERT and WRIGHT.) It therefore represents the views of the Senate, and of the majority of my colleagues, (Mr. Faxon,) and for the principles it embodies we are responsible to our constituents and to the country. It may be proper to remark, that prior to our election my colleagues (Messrs. WRIGHT and GILBERT) and myself declared our opinions in favor of the mode of settling private claims by the Senate, and in opposition to the proposition granting both the claimant and the United States the right of appeal for final adjudication to the Supreme Court of the United States. These were our opinions openly and boldly avowed before we were elected. What was the opinion of my colleague (Mr. Faxon) before his election, may be ascertained from his speech, and from the correspondence between him to his personal and political friend, Major Jacob B. Snyder, which was freely circulated among the members of the Legislature and through the country, before the Senatorial

I have made this statement, Mr. President, to show that the indictment filed by the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Brewster) against this bill covers broad ground in California, and that the bill is not even more sweeping than what was proposed to a select in Congress by the organization of the State Government. And sir, I go further, and say, so far as my knowledge extends, the landholders of that country desire this mode of giving them a final and speedy adjustment of their claims. There may be exceptions, but I have not met with them, and I freely canvassed the State to ascertain as far as possible the feelings of the people. I have seen the majority of the largest landholders in California, and probably as deeply interested in a punctual point of view in these land claims as any man in the State, has had frequent interviews with me since I brought this bill before the Senate, and has declared his unequivocal preference for over that of my colleague. I made some immaterial amendments to the bill as it came before me, and I have no doubt that the Senate will see them as he does. He says, what every man who knows any thing of public sentiment in California must say, that no board of commissioners whose decisions in favor of land

accused of asking for their constituents more than Congress thought them entitled to, but this is the first instance within my knowledge that they have been charged with depopulating their constituents to enrich the General Government.

The position of the delegation from a new State is at all times delicate, and their duties arduous. They, if any members of Congress, are entitled to have extended to them the generous confidence of their associates. Forced by the necessities of their State to bring forward many and important measures, the passage of which are essential to the prosperity of their constituents, and subjected to the assailed at home by the same rivals and enemies, they are interested to be aided by the legislation for the benefit of the State at large, charged with doing two quite by some, and too much by others; and, no matter how pure their motives, falsely assailed by base and unscrupulous calumniators, with legislating for their own benefit, a member of Congress from a State just admitted into the Union has to pass through an ordeal that no man can appreciate until he tries it. I do not wish to be understood as

ago a similar train of argument was used by him in opposition to a bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. At the last session he was stopped in the midst, not, the beginning, of a similar argument by the hour of adjournment, which postponed the passage of the bill to settle these claims to this session, although California was suffering for the want of it then.

The Senator from Missouri, no doubt from a conscientious discharge of his duty, has, in my opinion, interposed more obstacles to the settlement of land claims in California than

any or every other member of either House of Congress. He has defeated every bill that has heretofore been brought before the Senate on this subject. If he had, with his great expense, succeeded in passing the bill, three years ago, and had been perfecting the bill from the Committee, it might have been instead of visiting it with his fierce denunciation, it might then have been passed, and most, if not all, of the California land claims would have been settled forever, to the incalculable benefit of the people of that country: and the same may be said of the claims acknowledged by him in the last session. I hope it will not meet with the same fate now. I have no doubt it will proceed to discharge its duty to the country by the passage of this or some other measure, by the operation of which these land claims may be finally settled, and the people of California may know what portion of that country belongs to private individuals, and what portion is public domain. I move to postpone the further consideration of the bill until to-morrow.

Mr. BENTON. It is my intention from this time forth that no statement shall be about me in point of fact shall pass upon the floor. That is my intention. Now, sir, I have no objection to charging my colleagues in the House with any charges against his colleagues in the House, or even I made any with any design or intention to injure either them or their constituents. I have made no such charges. I happen to know, I happen to have been here long enough to know that a debate ought to be conducted without being personal. I have known how to know that, and I happen to know how to conduct a debate.

it into personality. Sir, none of my debates are personalities. I spoke of the character and effects of the bill which the Senator has brought before the Senate. I spoke of the effects of making these titles run the gauntlet through three different trials, and one of them here in the Supreme Court of the United States. I spoke of that at the last session, and ex-

That is what I propose to do at a proper time.

Now, with respect to this letter of Mr. Fremont, it applies to one of the recent grants made in 1844, I believe, and not to the other grants made in 1845. The grant was made on a special exemption from possession, and on account of the dangers, and these not imaginary; for six months were killed during the first year that Mr. Fremont came upon it. Now, as this grant to Mr. Fremont seemed destined to make so large a figure, I must be permitted to say that he had no more to do with the selection of it or with its purchase than you, sir. He had an agent, now in this country, and perhaps still in California, who was sent to buy land for the United States Company, Mr. Larkin, was requested to buy him a rancho, expecting, I believe, it would be got from the northwest of the bay of San Francisco. But, failing in that, Mr. Larkin bought this lot. This is a statement of the facts in the case; and this letter which has been read applies to his own grants, which were the last which the local authorities could make. The Government grants appeared to have come from the Governor-General of California, Mr. Micheltorena, the last one ever sent out from the Central Government, and whom the people expelled from the Government in that revolution which brought the people themselves into the pos-

With these few remarks, to correct the statements made by the Senator from California, I wish to state that I make no charges against him nor against any body. I understand the decorum of this body and of my place, and I would not do it if I could. I would not say that I have no charges to make against him or his colleagues in the other branch of Congress, I deny the effect of his measure out and out, and I say that I spoke against the effect of his measure, and I say that I meant to make good what I say against the effect of his measure when I read the title shall come.

MR. GWIN. I read the official report of what the Senator from California said, and I wish to say in order that I may be understood that I do not wish to say that I have no charge to make against him or his colleagues in the other branch of Congress. I wish to say that I might comment upon its property. It is stated there that the effect of the bill proposed will be to despoil the people of California of a portion of their property. I felt it to be my duty to say to my Senators that this bill was agreed upon in its principles by myself and my colleagues of the House of Representatives. Now, if the Senator from Missouri is correct in

to sustain. I do not charge in the slightest degree any imputation upon his claim. I know it was purchased by his agent, and that that gentleman is most desirous that Col. Fremont should possess it. I know that my colleague knew nothing of the purchase of this claim, so that so far as he is concerned, there is no imputation in this matter. I am not charging against him or his claim. I am not going to take advantage of any prejudice in that country against large claims; I am going to see, so far as I can, that these large claims are not prejudiced.

The measure I have brought forward is intended to protect them, and give them a right to have their claims tested fairly before a tribunal which has the confidence of the whole country. I take it the officers of this Government will not press the case of any individual claimant against the Government, or against the people of California when there is a ground for an appeal to the Supreme Court. If I thought there would be facilities afforded by the bill to prejudice the claims of any one unfairly, I would not support it. We know there are some claims made in the papers which have been agitating the people, and I want those claims investigated properly. It is

coffees, salt, to report to the Senate the quantity and value of tea, coffee, salt, sugar, flour, grain, and provisions generally, wool, coal, and iron, the produce of foreign countries, imported and exported; the value of the produce of cotton, wool, and of the produce of foreign countries; of pig, copper, and of French merchandise imported and exported; the quantity and value of cotton, tobacco, rice, flour, grain, provisions generally, and naval stores, domestic produce, exported; the value of cotton manufactured, domestic produce, exported; the quantity of shipping built, and the number of immigrants from foreign countries during the last fiscal year.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hope that resolution will be passed by for the present. I am informed that information will be furnished to the committee, and I think that to pass that resolution in its present shape, I move to lay the resolution upon the table.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF A POST OFFICE CONTRACTOR.

The bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont, came upon the question of its passage.

Mr. DAWSON. I desire to hear the grounds upon which this bill is introduced. I think that the bill and the report of the committee upon it are so framed that the bill and the report of the committee may be read, as I wish to know whether it is so, on the ground that the Postmaster General has failed to fulfill a contract upon which he has entered.

The bill and report were then read.

Mr. DAWSON. The principle which this bill seeks to establish is this: that the Postmaster General thinks it for the interest of the public to issue a contract for the continuance of the contract for carrying the mail on any route daily, and the contractor should go on in violation of that order and carry the mail daily, the Congress of the United States must then interpose between the Department and the contractor, and prevent him from carrying the mail in violation of the order of the Postmaster General. We have now just the case depending upon a contract upon a line between Georgia and Alabama, and the same controversy has arisen. If we depart from the principle of leaving this matter to the discretion of the Postmaster General, he can never know to what extent

appropriately may be necessary to fulfil the contracts, or to pay claims for service rendered without the authority of the proper Department. For one, I feel unwilling to interpose ; I shall sustain the Department in carrying the laws relating to the Department into effect.

Mr. UPHAM. I am sorry that this bill has met with so much opposition, as it seems to be a plain case. The Senator

Now, is there a Senator on this floor who desires that this person should carry this mail even after the service has expired for nothing, when he did it for the convenience of the public, and on account of the embarrassed condition of the Post Office Department? I admit he has no legal claim I admit that the Postmaster General is right, because he had given the order to discontinue the carrying of the mail one day after the expiration of the term, it is not just, as between this Government and the contractor, but the Government is solvent and able to pay for the service, he should be paid for his outlay? No interest is asked whatever. The applicant is in reduced circumstances, and as similar claims have been allowed, I think we should allow this claim, as I said, of five thousand dollars was allowed at the last session, and the report of the chairman of the committee. That was a contract. General had a certain distance with a two-horse coach, and take the passengers which came on the other part of the route with four horses, and be applied for liberty to put a four-horse coach upon the route. The Postmaster General objected, and told him to use a two-horse coach according to the contract. He, however, put on a four-horse coach. General allowed him five thousand dollars for the service he rendered. Now, I know that the Postmaster General ordered the discontinuance of the service from Royalton to Burlington for one day in the week. But it appears that it gave great inconvenience to those interested in the mail matter, and that they were obliged to go to the Post Office Department and

The service would have been discontinued for one day in the course of the entire route. But this route was in the hands of the contractor, and it was not the business of the Post Office to interfere with the contractor. The individual who contracted to carry the mail on this portion of the route, had stock enough to carry the mail according to the contract; but there was a part of the route discontinued while the contractor was on the ends of the line the mail was run every day. This was a source of inconvenience to every one upon the route. Yet it was not the business of the Post Office to interfere with the contractor. The Department, because citizens in any part of the country might advise or desire it. This, however, was a peculiar case, because the mail would be stopped in the centre of the line for one day. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that it is wrong, equally applicable to the Congress of the United States. There have been cases where the mail has been more than a half a dozen cases, precisely parallel, in which the service has been rendered, and compensation made for it.

Mr. POWSON. Do you like to ask the chairman of questions?

THE CHAIRMAN. I will ask the gentleman if the Committee on the Post Office has any recommendation to the Post Office Department has ever made any recommendation to either branch of Congress in relation to this particular application—whether they have stated that the public service demanded that the mail should be carried every day, and that the Post Office Department should be directed to do so? The Office Department that the Postmaster General had directed this service to be suspended one day in the week.

Q. I presume you have mail called every day in the week for the purpose of carrying it to the Postmaster General, and that you have been called upon sometimes to procure the carrying of the mail every day in the week, in violation of an order of the Department, and subsequently should come and ask Congress to compensate the contractor for his services? How could we manage this great machinery, and what confidence could the Postmaster General have in any estimate which he may make and lay before Congress, and how can he ask for suitable appropriations for carrying the mails, if this principle is to prevail? I think the principle for which I contend, and not for the amount of money that the Postmaster General has a right to charge for this service, is the principle of conformity to the laws of the country, and that I cannot see how this party can have any claim upon us. Although it is said there are precedents for allowing this claim, I think they must have passed without the consideration of Congress, as this measure did yesterday; for it did not even come to my knowledge yesterday. If this question had been presented to me, in relation to this very point, I should have given it as my opinion that

any other ever presented. It is said this was an infringement upon the rights of the public, and that the other parts of the route were running daily, and that in consequence of the solicitations of business men upon the route, the contractor determined to run this seventy-six miles every day in the week also. If that be so, and if there were four horse coaches employed, then it was for the convenience of passengers, and not for the convenience of the contractor, and he is not to be punished for the convenience of passengers? The law of 1848 is strictly against that. We made a law that we should pay for carrying the mails, and according to the contract no other service shall be paid for. It was for the convenience, for the accommodation of passengers to run four horse coaches, and not for the convenience of the contractor. If he will have to do it without it, we pay for carrying the mail, and when we have said this we pay according to law, we have done our duty. If this principle has heretofore been violated, I think it is time we should put an end to its further violation, and that the Office of Postmaster General should be held responsible to show that there is no violation of duty on the part of that Department. In this instance it is clearly shown that the Postmaster General performed his duty faithfully to the Government.

Mr. GWINN. I move to postpone this subject in order to take up California mail.

Mr. UPHAM. I move to state that there is a slight mistake in the statement made by the Chairman of the Committee, (Mr. Rusk.) I stated that the distance from Boston to

Burlington was two hundred and thirty miles, and that the distance from Royalton to Burlington was seventy-six miles, and that this was at the end of the route where the order to discontinue the service was made. I stated also that the very reason why this mail was run was on account of the urgent solicitation from citizens upon this part of the route. I say again that the arrested bill was not a part of the mail.

The PRESIDENT. The proposition before the Senate is to postpone the further consideration of this bill till to-morrow. The question being taken, and a division being called, there were : Ayes 19, noes 19.

So the motion to postpone was not agreed to.

The question was then taken on the passage of the bill, and it was agreed to.

FORTIFICATION OF SHIP ISLAND.

LAND TITLES IN CALIFORNIA.
On motion of Mr. GWIN, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill to ascertain and settle the private land claims in the State of California.
After a debate of considerable length the further consideration of the bill was postponed, and the Senate adjourned to

day.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Arkansas, by unanimous consent, offered the following resolution :

resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. BOWLER, of Missouri, in the chair,) and proceeded to consider the bills on the private calendar.

to the House, with the recommendation to

A bill granting a pension to Sarah A. Bush.
A bill for the relief of Joseph Johnson.
A bill for the relief of Polly Carver, executrix of Nathan Carver.
A bill for the relief of John Poe, of Louisville, Kentucky.

A bill to provide compensation to Wm. Woodbridge and H. C. Woodbridge for services in adjusting titles to lands in Michigan, and for other purposes.

A bill to compensate and reimburse the owners and crew of the whaling ship Chandler Pike the losses and expenses incurred in ransoming the crew of the ship Columbia.

On motion of Mr. WALDO, the amount in the bill granting to the estate of Mrs. Mary Ann, widow, of Ezra Pike, deceased, was increased from \$44 to \$54 76.

On motion of Mr. DUNHAM, the bill for the relief of John Rosebery, was amended by making his pension commence on January 1st, 1850, instead of in 1844.

On motion of Mr. AYERETT, the bill for the relief of Thomas J. Dunham, was amended so as to make the pension commence in January, 1850, instead of in 1848.

On motion of Mr. DUNHAM, the bill to increase the pension of Henry Clegg, of Cooke county, Tennessee, was amended so as to make said increase commence in 1850, instead of in 1848.

On motion of Mr. MORRIS, the bill for the relief of Warren Raymond, was amended so as to make the pension commence in 1850, instead of 1846.

On motion of Mr. MORRIS, the bill for the relief of George S. Morris, was amended by making the pension begin in 1850, instead of 1849.

On motion of Mr. DUNHAM, the bill for the relief William Sparks was amended by making his pension commence

representatives of John Arnold, deceased, was objected to by Mr. PUTNAM.

The bill for the relief of Messrs. Watson, Chabot & Co. was, on motion Mr. THOMAS, laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be laid on the table.

The bill for the relief of the heirs of George F. Reed, deceased, was objected to by Mr. DUNHAM.

The bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Benjamin Fry, deceased, was objected to by Mr. CUYLER.

The bill for the relief Mrs. Susan C. Randall was objected to by Mr. McMILLIN.

The bill for the relief of the heirs of Nicholas Lachance and others, was objected to by Mr. DUNHAM.

The bill for the payment of a debt due to the heirs of Antoine Peltier, was objected to by Mr. DUNHAM.

The bill for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Wishart was objected to by Mr. MILLIKEN.

The committee having risen and reported their action to

where then concurred in by the House, and the bills were read the third time and passed.

Mr. MCGAUGHEY, by unanimous consent, submitted a minority report from the Committee of Elections in the name of the Committee, in relation to the case of "John A. King," contestant of the seat of Mr. MONROE, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GILBERT, by unanimous consent, in pursuance of previous notices, introduced the following joint resolution:

A Joint Resolution to make such of "An act making apportionment of the members of the House of Representatives of the 30th of June, 1851," approved September 28, 1850, as provides "for extra pay to the commissioned officers and enlisted men of the army of the United States serving in Oregon or California," as is in its own nature self-executing, to be in full force and effect from and after the 1st day of May next.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That so much of the act so before named as provides "for extra pay to the commissioned officers and enlisted men of the army of the United States serving in Oregon or California," is hereby made retrospective in its effect; so that the said allowance of extra pay shall commence and date from and after the 1st day of May next; and so that the commissioned officers and enlisted men of the army of the United States shall have served in California or Oregon at any time subsequent to the aforesaid first day of May next, and so that the commissioned officers and enlisted men declared entitled to receive said extra pay; and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to cause such commissioned officers

and enlisted men who may have served as mechanics, or
out of any moneys remaining in the Treasury which are ap-
propriated for the extra pay of officers and soldiers serving in Cali-
fornia and Oregon by the act above named.

The joint resolution was read twice and referred to the
Committee on Military Affairs.

And the Senate adjourned.